arXiv:1604.06370v1 [math.PR] 21 Apr 2016

The ruin problem for Lévy-driven linear stochastic equations with applications to actuarial models with negative risk sums

Yuri KABANOV[a], Serguei PERGAMENSHCHIKOV[b]

[a] *University of Franche Comté, Laboratoire de Mathématiques, 16 Route de Gray, 25030 Besançon cedex, France, and National Research University - Higher School of Economics, Russia*
Email: youri.kabanov@univ-fcomte.fr
[b] *Laboratoire de Mathématiques Raphaël Salem, Université de Rouen, Technopôle du Madrillet, 76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France, and National Research Tomsk State University, Russia*
Email: Serge.Pergamenchtchikov@univ-rouen.fr

Abstract

We obtain the exact asymptotic of the ruin probabilities for a process described by a linear stochastic differential equation defined by a pair of independent Lévy processes. We consider the setting which is used to model the evolution of the capital reserve invested in a risky asset for the company selling the annuity insurance or for a venture company selling innovations. The approach is based on Goldie's renewal theorems. We provide also conditions under which the ruin happens with probability one.

Keywords: Ruin probabilities, Dual models, Price process, Renewal equation, Autoregression with random coefficients, Lévy process
MSC 60G44

1. Introduction

The general ruin problem can be formulated as follows. We are given a family of scalar processes X^u with the initial values $u \geq 0$. The object of interest is the exit probability of X^u from the positive half-line as a function of u. More formally, let $\tau^u := \inf\{t\colon X^u_t \leq 0\}$. The question is to determine the function $\Psi(u,T) := \mathbf{P}(\tau^u \leq T)$ (the ruin probability on a finite interval$[0,T]$) or $\Psi(u) := \mathbf{P}(\tau^u < \infty)$ (the ruin probability on $[0,\infty[$). The exact solution

of the problem is available only in rare cases. E.g., for $X^u = u + W$ where W is the Wiener process we have $\Psi(u, T) = P(\sup_{t \le T} W_t \ge u)$ and it remains to recall that the explicit formula for the distribution of the supremum of the Wiener process was obtained already in the Louis Bachelier thesis of 1900 which is, probably, the first ever mathematical study on continuous stochastic processes. Another example is the well-known explicit formula for $\Psi(u)$ in the Lundberg model of the ruin of insurance company with exponential claims. Of course, for more complicated cases the explicit formulae are not available and only asymptotic results or bounds can be obtained as it is done, e.g., in the Lundberg–Cramér theory.

In this paper we consider the ruin problem for a rather general model with X^u given as the solution linear stochastic equation

$$X_t^u = u + P_t + \int_{]0,t]} X_{s-}^u dR_s, \tag{1.1}$$

where P and R are independent Lévy processes starting from zero. There is a growing interest to models of this type because they describe the evolution of reserves of insurance companies investing in a risky asset, and the behavior of ruin probability in this case is radically different from that in the classical actuarial models. E.g., if the price of the risky asset follows the geometric Brownian motion, that is, $R_t = at + \sigma W_t$, and the risk process P is as in the Lundberg model, then $\Psi(u) = O(u^{1-2a/\sigma^2})$, $u \to \infty$, if $2a/\sigma^2 > 1$, and $\Psi(u) = 1$ otherwise, [8], [24], [12].

We are especially interested in the case where the process P describing the "business part" of the model has only upward jumps (in other words, P is spectrally positive). In the actuarial literature such models are referred to as the annuity insurance models (or models with negative risk sums), [10], [26], while in the modern literature they serve to describe the capital reserve of a venture company investing in RD and selling innovations; sometimes they are referred to as the dual models, [1], [2], [3], [4], etc.

The mentioned specificity of models with negative risk sums leads to a continuous downcrossing of the zero level by the reserve process. This allows us to obtain the exact (up to a multiplicative constant) asymptotic of the ruin probability under weak assumptions on the price dynamics. The main result of the paper (Theorem 2) claims that the ruin probability decreases as a power function when the initial capital increases to infinity. The decay parameter is determined as the positive root of a function depending only

on the parameters of the log price process. We provide sufficient conditions ensuring the existence of such a root.

The aim of our study is two-fold. The main goal is to get the exact asymptotic of the exit probability under the weakest conditions allowing by the method based on renewal equations (in this aspect we are based on the paper by Goldie, [9]). The second aim is a pedagogical one: to present the arguments which were used in a number of studies under various assumptions in a systematic and self-contained way. Our approach is closed in itself. Some of its ideas are close to that used in works by Paulsen and we advice the reader to compare our study with that of [22] (see also earlier papers [20], [23], [21], [19]).

The structure of the paper is the following. In Section 2 we formulate the model and prove the general but simple "intermediate" result, Theorem 2.2, which relates the asymptotic of the ruin probabilities with the asymptotic of solutions of renewal equations. Section 3 contains sufficient conditions guaranteeing the fulfillment of assumptions of Theorem 1 and leading to the main theorem which gives an upper asymptotic bounds for a model with jumps of both signs as well as exact asymptotic for a model with positive jumps. The renewal theorem on which are based our arguments leave open the question whether the asymptotic of the solution is exact. This can be done using lower asymptotic bounds based on the approach developed by Kalashnikov and Norberg, [13] (as was done in [8] and [12]). In this paper we prefer to use the logarithmic asymptotic bound in the spirit of Nyrhinen, [17], [18]. A succinct proof of the latter is given in Section 4. In Section 5 we establish results on the ruin with probability one developing the technique suggested in [8] and [24]. Our Theorems 5.4 and 5.5 imply, in particular, that in the classical model with negative risk sums and investments in the risky assets with price following a geometric Brownian motion the ruin is imminent if $a \leq \sigma^2/2$. In Section 6 we discuss examples. In the appendix we provide formulations of results from Goldie's paper used in the present study.

2. Ruin probabilities and solutions of renewal equations

In this section we prove a rather general theorem on asymptotic of ruin probabilities formulated in form adjusted to a straightforward use of Goldie's renewal theorems, postponing more specific results with conditions on the defining characteristics and ensuring its hypotheses to Section 3.

Let (a, σ^2, Π) and (a_P, σ_P^2, Π_P) be the Lévy triplets of the processes R and P. With these notations the canonical decomposition of R has the form

$$R_t = at + \sigma W_t + h(x) * (\mu - \nu)_t + \bar{h}(x) * \mu_t \tag{2.1}$$

where W is a Wiener process, $\mu(dt, dx)$ is the jump measure with the deterministic compensator $\nu(dt, dx) = dt\Pi(dx)$, see [11], [6], the truncation function $h(x) := xI_{\{|x|\leq 1\}}$ and $\bar{h}(x) := x - h(x)$. Recall that

$$\Pi(|x|^2 \wedge 1) := \int (|x|^2 \wedge 1)\Pi(dx) < \infty.$$

The process P describing the actuarial part of the model admits a similar representation:

$$P_t = a_P t + \sigma_P W_t^P + h(x) * (\mu^P - \nu^P)_t + \bar{h}(x) * \mu_t^P. \tag{2.2}$$

The Lévy processes R and P generate the filtration $\mathbf{F}^{R,P} = (\mathcal{F}_t^{R,P})_{t\geq 0}$.

Standing assumption.

S.0 *The Lévy measure* Π *is concentrated on the interval* $]-1, \infty[$, *that is* $\Pi(]-\infty, -1]) = 0$*;* σ^2 *and* Π *do not vanish simultaneously.*

In the context of financial models where the stochastic exponential

$$\mathcal{E}_t(R) = e^{R_t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t + \sum_{s\leq t}(\ln(1+\Delta R_s) - \Delta R_s)}$$

stands for the price of a risky asset (e.g., stock), the hypothesis **S.0**, ensuring that $\mathcal{E}(R) > 0$, is natural. The case where both $\sigma^2 = 0$ and $\Pi = 0$ corresponds to non-risky investments. In the classical models also $a = 0$, that is, the interest rate is zero.

The solution of the non-homogeneous linear equation (1.1) is expressed by the formula

$$X_t^u = \mathcal{E}_t(R)(u - Y_t) \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$Y_t := -\int_{]0,t]} \mathcal{E}_{s-}^{-1}(R) dP_s = -\int_{]0,t]} e^{-V_{s-}} dP_s$$

with $V := \ln \mathcal{E}(R)$. The log price process V can be written in the form

$$V_t = at - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 t + \sigma W_t + h(x) * (\mu - \nu)_t + (\ln(1 + x) - h(x)) * \mu_t. \tag{2.4}$$

Note that V is a Lévy process with the triplet (a_V, σ_V^2, Π_V) where

$$a_V = a - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \Pi(h(\ln(1+x)) - h(x)),$$

$\sigma_V^2 = \sigma^2$, and $\Pi_V = \Pi\varphi^{-1}$, where $\varphi : x \mapsto \ln(1+x)$.

The positivity of $\mathcal{E}(R)$ implies that $\tau^u = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \ Y_t \geq u\}$.

Put

$$M := e^{-V_1}, \qquad Q := Y_1 = -\int_{]0,1]} e^{-V_{t-}} dP_t. \tag{2.5}$$

Denoting by $\mathcal{L}(\xi)$ the distribution of random variable ξ and by $\mathcal{L}(\xi)^a$ its absolute continuous component, we introduce the following conditions:

H.1 *There exists a finite limit* $Y_\infty = \lim_{t\to\infty} Y_t$ *a.s.*

H.2 *The support of* $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ *is unbounded from above, i.e.* $\mathbf{P}\,(Q > y) > 0$ *for every* $y > 0$.

H.3 *There is* $\beta > 0$ *such that* $\mathbf{E}M^\beta = 1$ *and*

(i) $\mathcal{L}(\ln M)$ *is non-arithmetic,* $\mathbf{E}M^\beta |\ln M| < \infty$*;*

(ii) $\mathcal{L}(M)^a \neq 0$ *and there exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{E}\, M^{\beta+\delta} < \infty, \qquad \mathbf{E}\, |Q|^{\beta+\delta} < \infty, \qquad \mathbf{E}\, M^{\beta+\delta+i\theta} \neq 1 \quad \forall\, \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.6}$$

The following lemma is due to Paulsen and Gjessing, see [23].

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that* **H.1**, **H.2** *hold. Then* $\Psi(u) > 0$ *for every* $u > 0$ *and*

$$\Psi(u) = \frac{G(u)}{\mathbf{E}\,(G(X_{\tau^u}) \,|\, \tau^u < \infty)} \leq \frac{G(u)}{G(0)}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $G(u) := \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty > u)$.

In particular, if $\Pi_P(]-\infty, 0]) = 0$*, then* $\Psi(u) = G(u)/G(0)$.

Proof. Let τ be an arbitrary stopping time with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t^{P,R})$. As we assume that the finite limit Y_∞ exists, the random variable

$$Y_{\tau,\infty} := \begin{cases} -\lim_{N\to\infty} \int_{]\tau,\tau+N]} e^{-(V_{t-}-V_\tau)} dP_t, & \tau < \infty, \\ 0, & \tau = \infty, \end{cases}$$

is well defined. On the set $\{\tau < \infty\}$

$$Y_{\tau,\infty} = e^{V_\tau}(Y_\infty - Y_\tau) = X_\tau + e^{V_\tau}(Y_\infty - u). \tag{2.8}$$

Let ξ be a $\mathcal{F}_\tau^{P,R}$-measurable random variable. Since the Lévy process starts afresh at every stopping time, the conditional distribution of $Y_{\tau,\infty}$ given $(\tau,\xi) = (t,x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ is the same as the distribution of Y_∞. It follows that

$$\mathbf{P}\left(Y_{\tau,\infty} > \xi,\ \tau < \infty\right) = \mathbf{E}\, G(\xi)\, \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau<\infty\}}.$$

Thus, if $\mathbf{P}(\tau < \infty) > 0$, then

$$\mathbf{P}\left(Y_{\tau,\infty} > \xi,\ \tau < \infty\right) = \mathbf{E}\left(G(\xi) \,|\, \tau < \infty\right)\, \mathbf{P}(\tau < \infty)\,.$$

Noting that

$$\Psi(u) = \mathbf{P}(\tau^u < \infty) \geq \mathbf{P}(Y_1 > u) = \mathbf{P}(Q > u) > 0$$

due to **H.2**, we deduce from here, using (2.8), that

$$\begin{aligned} G(u) &= \mathbf{P}\left(Y_\infty > u,\ \tau^u < \infty\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(Y_{\tau^u,\infty} > X_{\tau^u},\ \tau^u < \infty\right) \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left(G(X_{\tau^u}) \,|\, \tau^u < \infty\right)\, \mathbf{P}(\tau^u < \infty) \end{aligned}$$

implying the equality in (2.7). It remains to observe that $X_{\tau^u} \leq 0$ and, in the case where $\Pi_P(]-\infty, 0]) = 0$, the process X^u crosses zero in continuous way, i.e. $X_{\tau^u} = 0$. □

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that* **H.1**, **H.2**, *and* **H.3**(i) *hold and* $\mathbf{E}\,|Q|^\beta < \infty$. *Then*

$$\limsup_{u\to\infty}\ u^\beta\, \Psi(u)\ < \infty. \tag{2.9}$$

If, moreover, **H.3**(ii) *also holds and* $\Pi_P(]-\infty, 0]) = 0$, *then there exist constants* $C_\infty, \delta_* \in]0, \infty[$ *such that*

$$\lim_{u\to\infty}\ u^{\delta_*}\left(u^\beta(\Psi(u)\ - \ C_\infty\right). \tag{2.10}$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{u\to\infty}\ u^\beta\, \Psi(u)\ =\ C_\infty. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. Due to the above lemma, the study of asymptotic behavior of $\Psi(u)$ as $u \to \infty$ is reduced to investigating the tail of distribution of Y_∞. We shall proceed using ideas from discrete time models and the renewal theory.

We represent Y_n as follows:

$$Y_n := \sum_{j=1}^{n} Q_j \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} M_l, \tag{2.12}$$

where

$$M_j := e^{-(V_j - V_{j-1})}, \qquad Q_j := -\int_{]j-1,j]} e^{-(V_v - V_{j-1})} dP_v. \tag{2.13}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}(M_j) = \mathcal{L}(M)$, $\mathcal{L}(Q_j) = \mathcal{L}(Q)$, and the finite limit Y_∞ exists, it satisfies the renewal equation

$$Y_\infty \stackrel{d}{=} Q + M\, Y_\infty\,, \quad Y_\infty \text{ independent of } (M, Q).$$

According to Lemma 7.2

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} u^\beta G(u) = C_+$$

for some finite constant C_+ and, therefore,

$$\limsup_{u\to\infty}\, u^\beta\, \Psi(u) \,\le G(0) C_+.$$

In the case where $\Pi^P(]-\infty, 0]) = 0$ we have above the equality. It remains to show that $C_+ > 0$. To this end, we consider the sequence $Y_n^* := \max_{k\le n} Y_k$. A direct calculation shows that Y_∞^* is a solution of the renewal equation

$$Y_\infty^* \stackrel{d}{=} Q + M(Y_\infty^*)^+, \qquad Y_\infty^* \text{ independent of } (M, Q),$$

for which we can apply Lemma 7.3 in the appendix. The constant $\check{C}$ appeared in this lemma is strictly positive. Indeed, if it is zero, then $u^{\beta+\delta_*} P(Y_\infty^* > u) \to 0$ for some $\delta_* > 0$ in contradiction with Proposition 4.1 whose assumptions are fulfilled under our hypotheses.

By virtue of (2.3), $\{Y_\infty^* > u\} \subseteq \{\tau^u < \infty\}$, hence, $\mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u) \le \Psi(u)$. Since $u^\beta \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u) \to \check{C} > 0$, also the constant $C_+ > 0$. The theorem is proven. □

Remark 2.3. The paper [22] contains a similar result with conditions expressed in terms of the Lévy triplets.

Remark 2.4. Let $H : q \to \ln \mathbf{E}\, e^{-qV_1}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$. That is, $H(q) = \ln \mathbf{E} M^q$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}(V_1)$ is non-arithmetic, $H(\beta) = 0$ for some $\beta > 0$ and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $H(\beta + \delta) < \infty$ and $\mathbf{E}\, e^{-(q+\delta+i\theta)V_1} \ne 1$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2 concerning the integrability of M are fulfilled. In the next section we discuss some conditions in terms of the Lévy triplets implying them.

3. Sufficient conditions

Theorem 2.2 is an efficient tool allowing us to get results on the asymptotic of ruin probabilities in the case of actuarial models with negative risk sum. In particular, it claims that the rate of decay of the ruin probabilities at infinity us determined by the positive root β of the equation $H(q) = 0$ where $H : q \to \ln \mathbf{E}\, e^{-qV_1}$, $q \in \mathbb{R}$. In this section we provide some sufficient conditions ensuring the existence and uniqueness of such a root as well as the hypotheses of Theorem 2.2.

Let

$$J(q) := \Pi\big(I_{\{|\ln(1+x)|>1\}}\, e^{-q\ln(1+x)}\big) = \Pi\big(I_{\{|\ln(1+x)|>1\}}(1+x)^{-q}\big) \tag{3.1}$$

and let

$$\underline{q} := \inf\{q \le 0\colon\ J(q) < \infty\}, \qquad \bar{q} := \sup\{q \ge 0\colon\ J(q) < \infty\}.$$

We consider the function $H : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ with

$$H(q) := -a_V q + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} q^2 + L(q) \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$L(q) := \Pi\big(e^{-q\ln(1+x)} - 1 + qh(\ln(1+x))\big), \tag{3.3}$$

$$a_V := a - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \Pi(h(\ln(1+x)) - h(x)). \tag{3.4}$$

It is clear that H is convex and finite on the set $\{J(q) < \infty\} \supseteq]\underline{q}, \bar{q}[$.

If $J(q) < \infty$, then the process $m = (m_t(q))_{t\le 1}$ with

$$m_t(q) := e^{-qV_t - tH(q)} \tag{3.5}$$

is a martingale and

$$\mathbf{E}\, e^{-qV_t} = e^{tH(q)}, \qquad t \in [0,1]. \tag{3.6}$$

In particular, we have that $H(q) = \ln \mathbf{E}\, e^{-qV_t} = \ln \mathbf{E} M^q$.

Moreover, the above properties hold in the case where q is replaced by any complex number $z = y_1 + iy_2$ such that $y_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $J(y_1) < \infty$ see, e.g., Th. 25.17 in [25].

In the sequel we shall use the following property:

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1} e^{-qV_t} < \infty \qquad \forall\, q \in]\underline{q}, \bar{q}[. \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed, let $q \in]0, \bar{q}[$. Take $r \in]1, \bar{q}/q[$. Then $\mathbf{E}\, m_1^r(q) = e^{H(qr)-rH(q)} < \infty$. By virtue of the Doob inequality the maximal function $m_1^*(q) := \sup_{t\le 1} m_t(q)$ belongs to L^r and remains to observe that $e^{-qV_t} \le C_q m_t(q)$ where the constant $C_q = \sup_{t\le 1} e^{tH(q)}$. Similar arguments work for $q \in]\underline{q}, 0[$.

Now we provide some sufficient condition ensuring the existence of $\beta > 0$ such that $H(\beta) = 0$.

Put $L_* := \limsup_{q\uparrow\bar{q}} L(q)/q$ and introduce the following conditions:

A.0 $\bar{q} > 0$.

A.1 $a_V + \Pi(\bar{h}(\ln(1+x)) > 0$.

A.2 $L_* + (\sigma^2/2)\bar{q} - a_V > 0$.

The next lemma ensures the existence of the decay parameter β.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that* **A.0** $-$ **A.2** *hold. Then there exists unique* $\beta > 0$ *such that* $H(\beta) = 0$, $H < 0$ *on* $]0, \beta[$ *and* $H > 0$ *on* $]\beta, \infty[$.

Proof. Since H is continuous function on the interval $[0, q_*[\neq \emptyset$, it is sufficient to check that $H(q) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $q > 0$ and $H(q) > 0$ for all $q < \bar{q}$ and sufficiently close to $\bar{q}$. To establish the first property we use the decomposition

$$L(q) = L_1(q) + L_2(q) + L_3(q) \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(q) &:= \Pi\big((e^{-q\ln(1+x)} - 1)I_{\{\ln(1+x)<-1\}}\big), \\ L_2(q) &:= \Pi\big((e^{-q\ln(1+x)} - 1 + q\ln(1+x))I_{\{-1\le\ln(1+x)\le 11\}}\big), \\ L_3(q) &:= \Pi\big((e^{-q\ln(1+x)} - 1)I_{\{\ln(1+x)>1\}}\big). \end{aligned}$$

Calculating the right derivative D^+ at zero of the above integrals we get that

$$D^+L_1(0) = -\Pi\big(\ln(1+x)I_{\{\ln(1+x)<-1\}}\big) < \infty,$$

$D^+L_2(0) = 0$, and $D^+L_3(0) = -\Pi\big(\ln(1+x)|I_{\{\ln(1+x)>1\}}\big)$ (this derivative may be equal to $-\infty$). It follows that

$$D^+H(0) = -a_V - \Pi(\bar{h}(\ln(1+x)) < 0$$

when the condition **A.1** holds. Due to **A.2** we get that

$$\limsup_{q\uparrow\bar{q}} H(q)/q = L_* + (\sigma^2/2)\bar{q} - a_V > 0.$$

It follows that the function H has a positive root. It is unique. Indeed, suppose that there are two positive roots $\beta_1 < \beta_2$. The function H is convex. Since this function is negative at some point $q \in]0, \beta_1[$ and equal to zero at β_2, it is negative at β_1 in contradiction with the assumption. □

Remark 3.2. It is easily seen that the conditions $\bar{q} > 0$ (i.e., **A.0**) and $D^+H(0) < 0$ (i.e., **A.1**) are necessary to ensure that $H(q) < 0$ for all sufficiently small $q > 0$. Similarly, the condition $\underline{q} < 0$ and the left derivative $D^-H(0) > 0$ are necessary to ensure that $H(q) < 0$ for sufficiently small (in absolute value) $q < 0$.

Let Π^a denote the absolute continuous component of Π with respect to the Lebesgue measure and let $\varrho(x) := d\Pi^a/dx$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let the conditions* **A.0** $-$ **A.2** *hold and, therefore, there is* $\beta > 0$ *such that* $H(\beta) = 0$. *Suppose that* $\sigma^2 + \Pi^a(\mathbb{R}) > 0$. *Then there exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that* $H(\beta + \delta + i\theta) \neq 0$ *whatever is* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Arguing by contradiction suppose that for arbitrary small $\delta > 0$ there exists a complex number $q_\delta := \beta_\delta + i\theta_\delta$, where $\beta_\delta := \beta + \delta$, such that $H(q_\delta) = 0$, i.e. $\operatorname{Re} H(q_\delta) = H(\beta)$ $(= 0)$ and $\operatorname{Im} H(q_\delta) = 0$. Using the formula (3.2) and regrouping terms in the first of these identities we get that

$$a_V(\beta-\beta_\delta)+\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(\beta_\delta^2-\theta_\delta^2-\beta^2) = \Pi\big(e^{-\beta_\delta \ln(1+x)}(1-\cos(\theta_\delta \ln(1+x)))\big)+\Upsilon_{1,\delta}+\Upsilon_{2,\delta}, \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_{1,\delta} &:= \Pi\big(I_{\{|\ln(1+x)|\le 1\}}\left(e^{-\beta \ln(1+x)} - e^{-\beta_\delta \ln(1+x)} - (\beta_\delta - \beta)\ln(1+x)\right)\big),\\ \Upsilon_{2,\delta} &:= \Pi\big(I_{\{|\ln(1+x)|> 1\}}\left(e^{-\beta \ln(1+x)} - e^{-\beta_\delta \ln(1+x)}\right)\big).\end{aligned}$$

On the set $\{x : \ |\ln(1+x)| \le 1\}$

$$|e^{-\beta \ln(1+x)} - e^{-\beta_\delta \ln(1+x)} - (\beta_\delta - \beta)\ln(1+x)| \le C\, \ln^2(1+x).$$

Thus, the dominated convergence theorem implies that $\Upsilon_{1,\delta} \to 0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$.

Due to **A.0** the family of functions $\{e^{-\beta_\delta \ln(1+x)} I_{\{|\ln(1+x)|>1\}}\}_{\delta\le(\bar q-\beta)/2}$, is uniformly integrable with respect to Π. Therefore, $\Upsilon_{2,\delta}\to 0$ as $\delta\downarrow 0$.

If $\sigma>0$, then (3.9) implies immediately that $\theta_\delta\to 0$ as $\delta\downarrow 0$. If $\sigma=0$, then

$$\lim_{\delta\downarrow 0}\int e^{-\beta_\delta \ln(1+x)}(1-\cos(\theta_\delta\ln(1+x))\,\Pi(dx)=0. \tag{3.10}$$

Note that $\limsup|\theta_\delta|<\infty$. Indeed, suppose that it is not the case and there is a sequence $\delta^n\downarrow 0$ such that $|\theta_{\delta^n}|\to\infty$. By assumption, there is a bounded measurable set $\Gamma\subseteq]-1,\infty[$ such that $0<\Pi^a(\Gamma)<\infty$. Using the Riemann–Lebesgue lemma we get that

$$\int_\Gamma e^{-\beta_{\delta^n}\ln(1+x)}\,(1-\cos(\theta_{\delta^n}\ln(1+x))\,\varrho(x)\,dx\to\int_\Gamma e^{-\beta\ln(1+x)}\,\varrho(x)\,dx>0$$

in contradiction with (3.10). Supposing that the sequence θ_{δ^n} converges to a finite limit θ_0, we obtain from (3.10) that

$$\int_\Gamma e^{-\beta_\delta\ln(1+x)}(1-\cos(\theta_0\ln(1+x))\,\varrho(x)\,dx=0\,.$$

This implies that $\theta_0=0$, i.e. $\theta_\delta\to 0$ as $\delta\downarrow 0$.

Note that

$$\operatorname{Im}L(q_\delta)=\Pi\big(\theta_\delta h(\ln(1+x))-e^{-\beta_\delta\ln(1+x)}\sin(\theta_\delta\ln(1+x))\big).$$

If $|\ln(1+x)|\le 1$, then

$$\left|\ln(1+x)-e^{-\beta_\delta\ln(1+x)}\frac{\sin(\theta_\delta\ln(1+x))}{\theta_\delta}\right|\le C\ln^2(1+x);$$

if $|\ln(1+x)|>1$, then

$$\left|e^{-\beta_\delta\ln(1+x)}\frac{\sin(\theta_\delta\ln(1+x))}{\theta_\delta}\right|\le C|\ln(1+x)|\,e^{-\beta_\delta\ln(1+x)}.$$

Using these bounds we easily get that

$$\lim_{\theta_\delta\to 0}\frac{1}{\theta_\delta}\operatorname{Im}L(q_\delta)=\Pi\big(h(\ln(1+x))-e^{-\beta\ln(1+x)}\ln(1+x)\big). \tag{3.11}$$

Letting $\delta\downarrow 0$ in the identity $\operatorname{Im}H(q_\delta)/\theta_\delta=0$, we obtain that

$$-a_V+\sigma^2\beta+\Pi\big(h(\ln(1+x))-e^{-\beta\ln(1+x)}\ln(1+x)\big)=0.$$

On the other hand, $H(\beta) = 0$, i.e.

$$-a_V\beta + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\beta^2 + \Pi\big(e^{-\beta\ln(1+x)} - 1 + \beta h(\ln(1+x))\big) = 0.$$

Combining the last two relations we obtain the equality

$$\beta^2\sigma^2/2 = \Pi(f(\beta\ln(1+x)))$$

where $f(y) := (1+y)e^{-y} - 1$. Since $f(y) < 0$ for all $y \neq 0$, it is possible only if $\sigma = 0$ and $\Pi = 0$, but this case is excluded by our hypothesis. □

Let $Y_* := \sup_{t\le 1}|Y_t|$.

The arguments below use the Novikov inequalities, [16] (also referred to as the Bichteler–Jacod inequalities, see [5], [15]). They give the following bounds for the moments of supremum of purely discontinuous local martingales in dependence of a parameter $\alpha \in [1,2]$:

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1}|g*(\mu-\nu)_t|^p \le C_{p,\alpha}\begin{cases}\mathbf{E}\left(|g|^\alpha * \nu_1\right)^{p/\alpha}, & \forall\, p\in]0,\alpha],\\ \mathbf{E}\left(|g|^\alpha * \nu_1\right)^{p/\alpha} + \mathbf{E}\,|g|^p * \nu_1, & \forall\, p\in[\alpha,\infty[.\end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let* **A.0** *holds and* $\Pi_P(|\bar h|^\varepsilon) < \infty$ *for some* $\varepsilon \in]0,1]$. *Then* $\mathbf{E}\,Y_*^p < \infty$ *for any* $p \in]0, \bar q\wedge\varepsilon[$.

Proof. We use the elementary inequality $(\sum x_k)^\eta \le \sum x_k^\eta$, where $x_k \ge 0$, $k = 1,\dots,n$ and $\eta \in]0,1]$. It allows us to treat separately each term in the representation

$$P_t = a_P t + \sigma_P W_t^P + h(x) * (\mu^P - \nu^P)_t + \bar h(x) * \mu_t^P.$$

Applying this inequality to the integral with respect to the integer-valued measure μ which is just a sum, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\,(e^{-V_-}|\bar h(x)| * \mu_1^P)^p &\le \mathbf{E}\,e^{-pV_-}|\bar h(x)|^p * \mu_1^P = \Pi_P(|\bar h|^p)\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 e^{-pV_t}dt\\ &\le \Pi_P(|\bar h|^p)\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1} e^{-pV_t}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\int_0^1 e^{-V_t}dt\right)^p \le \mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1} e^{-pV_t}. \tag{3.14}$$

By the Burkholder–Davis–Gundy inequality

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1}\Big|\int_0^t e^{-V_s}dW_s^P\Big|^p \le C_p\mathbf{E}\Big(\int_0^1 e^{-2V_s}ds\Big)^{p/2} \le C_p\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1}e^{-pV_t}. \qquad (3.15)$$

Using the Novikov inequality (with $\alpha = 2$) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1}\big|e^{-V_-}h(x)*(\mu^P-\nu^P)_t\big|^p &\le C_{p,2}(\Pi(h^2))^{p/2}\mathbf{E}\Big(\int_0^1 e^{-2V_t}dt\Big)^{p/2}\\ &\le C_{p,2}(\Pi(h^2))^{p/2}\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\le 1}e^{-pV_t}. \qquad (3.16)\end{aligned}$$

From these estimates and the property (3.7) we have that $\mathbf{E}\,Y_*^p < \infty$. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let* $\mathbf{A.0}-\mathbf{A.2}$ *hold and* $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^\varepsilon) < \infty$ *for some* $\varepsilon \in]0,1]$. *Then* $\mathbf{H.1}$ *holds.*

Proof. Take $p \in]0, \beta\wedge\varepsilon[$. According to Lemmata 3.1 and 3.4 we have that $\rho := \mathbf{E}\,M^p < 1$ and $\mathbf{E}\,Y_*^p < \infty$. It follows that

$$\mathbf{E}\Big(\sum_{n\ge 1}|Q_n|\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}M_j\Big)^p \le \sum_{n\ge 1}\mathbf{E}\,|Q_n|^p\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}M_j^p = \mathbf{E}\,|Q|^p\sum_{n\ge 1}\rho^{n-1} < \infty.$$

Using the representation (2.12) we obtain from here that $Y_n \to Y_\infty$ a.s. where Y_∞ is a finite random variable. Put

$$\Delta_n := \sup_{n-1\le v\le n}\Big|\int_{]n-1,v]} e^{-V_{s-}}\,dP_s\Big|, \qquad n \ge 1.$$

Note that

$$\mathbf{E}\,\Delta_n^p = \mathbf{E}\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}M_j^p\sup_{n-1\le v\le n}\Big|\int_{]n-1,v]} e^{-(V_{s-}-V_{n-1})}\,dP_s\Big|^p = \mathbf{E}\,Y_*^p\,\rho^{n-1}.$$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$ we get using the Chebyshev inequality that

$$\sum_{n\ge 1}\mathbf{P}(\Delta_n > \varepsilon) \le \varepsilon^{-p}E\,Y_*^p\sum_{n\ge 1}\rho^{n-1} < \infty.$$

Thus, by the Borel–Cantelli lemma $\Delta_n \to 0$ a.s., $n \to \infty$. This implies the convergence $Y_t \to Y_\infty$ a.s., $t \to \infty$. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let the conditions* **A.0**$-$**A.2** *hold and* $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^{\beta+\epsilon}) < \infty$ *for some* $\epsilon > 0$ *for which* $\beta + \epsilon < \bar{q}$. *Then there is* $\delta > 0$ *such that* $\mathbf{E}\, M^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$ *and* $\mathbf{E}\, Y_*^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$.

Proof. Note that **A.0** implies that $\mathbf{E}\, M^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$ for all $\delta > 0$ for which $\beta + \delta < \bar{q}$.

To get the moment condition for Y_* we start with the case where $\beta \in]0, 1[$. Take $\delta \in]0, \epsilon]$ such that $\beta_\delta = \beta + \delta < \bar{q}$. As in the proof above we get the estimates (3.13) – (3.16) with $p = \beta_\delta$ and we conclude that $\mathbf{E}\, Y_*^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$ using (3.7).

Let $\beta \in]1, 2[$. Due to our assumptions we can find $\delta > 0$ such that $\beta_\delta < \bar{q} \wedge 2$ and $\Pi(\bar{h}^{\beta_\delta}) < \infty$. By the Novikov inequality with $\alpha = 1$ and $p = \beta_\delta$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\le 1} |e^{-V_-}\bar{h}(x) * (\mu^P - \nu^P)_t|^p &\le C_{p,1}\Big(\big(\mathbf{E}\,(e^{-V_-}\bar{h}(x) * \nu_1^P\big)^p \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}\,(e^{-pV_-}\bar{h}(x)^p * \nu_1^P\Big) \\ &\le \tilde{C}_{p,1}\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\le 1} e^{-pV_t} < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_{p,1} := C_{p,1}\big(\big(\Pi_P(\bar{h})\big)^p + \Pi_P(\bar{h}^p)\big)$. Using again the Novikov inequality but with $\alpha = 2$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\le 1} |e^{-V_-}h(x) * (\mu^P - \nu^P)_t|^p &\le C_{p,2}\mathbf{E}\,(e^{-2V_-}h(x)^2 * \nu_1^P)^{p/2} \\ &\le C_{p,2}(\Pi_P(h^2))^p \mathbf{E} \sup_{t\le 1} e^{-pV_t} < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Estimates for the integrals with respect to dt and dW^P are of the same form as for the previous case. Using the inequality for the L^p-norm of the sum, we get that $\mathbf{E}\, Y_*^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$.

Finally, let $\beta \ge 2$. It is clear that in this case $\Pi(x^{\beta_\delta}) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$ for which $\beta_\delta < \bar{q}$. Using the Novikov inequality for $p = \beta_\delta \ge \alpha = 2$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\le 1} |g * (\mu - \nu)_t|^p &\le C_{p,2}\big(\Pi_P(|x|^2)\big)^{p/2}\,\mathbf{E}\Big(\int_0^1 e^{-2V_t}dt\Big)^{p/2} \\ &\quad + C_{p,2}\Pi_P(|x|^p)\,\mathbf{E}\int_0^1 e^{-pV_t}dt \\ &\le C_{p,2}\big(\big(\Pi_P(|x|^2)\big)^{p/2} + \Pi_P(|x|^p)\big)\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\le 1} e^{-pV_t} < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Again the arguments for the integrals with respect to dt and dW^P remain valid. $\square$

Remark 3.7. Let **A.0 – A.2** hold and $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^\beta) < \infty$. Then $\mathbf{E}\, Y_*^\beta < \infty$. The argument are the same as in the above proof (with $\delta = 0$).

Notations: $\tilde{a}_P^\varepsilon := \Pi_P(h(x) I_{\{|x|>\varepsilon\}}) - a_P$, $\tilde{a}_P^0 := \liminf_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \tilde{a}_P^\varepsilon$, $J := \int_0^1 e^{-V_v} dv$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\sigma_P^2 + (\tilde{a}_P^0)^+ > 0$. If the support of $\mathcal{L}(J)$ unbounded from above, then the support of $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ is also unbounded from above.*

Proof. We shall use the following obvious statement: if $f(x, y)$ is a measurable function and ξ, η are independent random variables with distributions $\mathbf{P}_\xi$ and $\mathbf{P}_\eta$, then the distribution of $f(\xi, \eta)$ is unbounded from below if the distribution $f(\xi, y)$ is unbounded from below for the set of y of positive measure $\mathbf{P}_\eta$.

If $\sigma_P^2 > 0$, then

$$Y_1 = -\sigma_P \int_{]0,1]} e^{-V_v} dW_v^P + \int_{]0,1]} e^{-V_v} d(\sigma_P W_v^P - P_v).$$

Applying the above observation (with $\xi = W^P$ and $\eta = (R, P - \sigma W^P)$) and taking into account that the Wiener integral of a positive deterministic function is a nonzero Gaussian random variable, we get that the distribution of Y_1 is unbounded.

So, it remains to consider only the case where $\sigma_P^2 = 0$ but $\tilde{a}_P^0 > 0$.

Define the locally square integrable martingale

$$\zeta_t^\varepsilon := e^{-V_-} I_{\{|x|\le\varepsilon\}} x * (\mu^P - \nu^P)_t. \tag{3.17}$$

Since $\langle \zeta^\varepsilon \rangle_1 = e^{-2V_-} I_{\{|x|\le\varepsilon\}} x^2 * \nu_1^P \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we have that $\sup_{t\le 1} |\zeta_t^\varepsilon| \to 0$ in probability.

Let us consider the set

$$\Gamma^\varepsilon := \{J \ge N,\ |\zeta_1^\varepsilon| \le 1,\ I_{\{|x|>\varepsilon\}} * \mu_1^P = 0\}.$$

Using the independence, we have that for every $N > 0$

$$\mathbf{P}(\Gamma^\varepsilon) = \mathbf{P}(J \ge N,\ |\zeta^\varepsilon| \le 1)\mathbf{P}(I_{\{|x|>\varepsilon\}} * \mu_1^P = 0) > 0$$

for all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Indeed, the support of distribution of J is unbounded from above, $\mathbf{P}(|\zeta_1^\varepsilon| \le 1) \to 1$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and $I_{\{|x|>\varepsilon\}} * \mu_1$ has the Poisson distribution with parameter $\Pi(x > \varepsilon)$. For all sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ also $\tilde{a}_P^\varepsilon \ge (\tilde{a}_P^0/2) \wedge 1$. On the set Γ^ε we have

$$Q := -\int_{]0,1]} e^{-V_v-} dP_v = \tilde{a}_P^\varepsilon J - \zeta_1^\varepsilon \ge ((\tilde{a}_P^0/2) \wedge 1)N - 1.$$

This implies the claimed property of Q. $\square$

Remark 3.9. *Let $\sigma_P^2 + (\tilde{a}_P^0)^+ > 0$. If the support of $\mathcal{L}(JI_{\{V_1<0\}})$ unbounded from above, then the support of $\mathcal{L}(QI_{\{V_1<0\}})$ is also unbounded from above.*

Lemma 3.10. *The support of $\mathcal{L}(J)$ is unbounded from above if and only if $\sigma^2 + \Pi(]-1,0[) > 0$ or $\Pi(h(x)I_{\{x>0\}}) = \infty$.*

Proof. In the case where $\sigma^2 > 0$ the claim is obvious: due to independence of W and the jump part of V, it is reduced to the same statement for the integral $\int_0^1 e^{-\sigma W_v} g(v)dv$ where $g > 0$ is a bounded deterministic function.

Suppose that $\sigma^2 = 0$ but $\Pi(]-1,0[) > 0$, i.e. $\Pi(]-1,-\varepsilon[) > 0$ for some $\varepsilon \in]0,1[$. In the considered case the process V given by (2.4) admits the decomposition

$$V_t = at + h(x) * (\mu - \nu)_t + (\ln(1+x) - h(x)) * \mu_t = V_t' + V_t'',$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_t' &:= (a - \Pi(xI_{\{-1<x\le-\varepsilon\}}))t + I_{\{-\varepsilon<x\le1\}}x * (\mu-\nu)_t \\ &\quad + (\ln(1+x) - x)I_{\{-\varepsilon<x\le1\}} * \mu_t + \ln(1+x)I_{\{x>1\}} * \mu_t, \\ V_t'' &:= \ln(1+x)I_{\{-1<x\le-\varepsilon\}} * \mu_t. \end{aligned}$$

The processes V' and V'' are independent. The decreasing process V'' has jumps of the size not smaller than $|\ln(1-\varepsilon)|$ and the number of jumps on the interval $[0,t]$ is a Poisson random variable with parameter $t\Pi(]-1,-\varepsilon[) > 0$. Hence, the support of distribution of V_t'' is unbounded from below for any $t \in]0,1[$. In particular, for any $N > 0$, the set where $e^{-V''} \ge N$ on the interval $[1/2,1]$ has a positive probability. The required property follows from these considerations.

Suppose that $\sigma^2 + \Pi(]-1,0[) = 0$ but $\Pi(h(x)I_{\{x>0\}}) = \infty$. In this case, the process V has only positive jumps. Take arbitrary $N > 1$ and choose

$\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\Pi(xI_{\{\varepsilon<x\le 1\}}) > 2N$ and $\Pi(I_{\{0<x\le\varepsilon\}}\ln^2(1+x)) \le 1/(32N^2)$. We have the decomposition

$$V_t = ct + V_t^{(1)} + V_t^{(2)} + V_t^{(3)},$$

where the processes

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^{(1)} &:= I_{\{0<x\le\varepsilon\}}\ln(1+x) * (\mu-\nu)_t, \\ V_t^{(2)} &:= I_{\{\varepsilon<x\le 1\}}\ln(1+x) * (\mu-\nu)_t, \\ V_t^{(3)} &:= I_{\{x>1\}}\ln(1+x) * \mu_t \end{aligned}$$

are independent and the constant

$$c := a + \Pi((\ln(1+x)-x)I_{\{0<x\le 1\}}) < \infty.$$

By the Doob inequality $P(\sup_{t\le 1} V_t^{(1)} < N/2) > 1/2$. The processes $V_t^{(2)}$ and $V_t^{(3)}$ has no jumps on $[0,1]$ with positive probabilities. In the absence of jumps the trajectory of $V_t^{(2)}$ is the linear function $y = -\Pi(xI_{\{\varepsilon<x\le 1\}})t \le -2Nt$. It follows that $\sup_{1/2\le t\le 1} V_t \le c - N/2$ on the set of positive probability. This implies that the support of $\mathcal{L}(J)$ is unbounded from above.

The "only if" part is obvious. □

Lemmas 3.8 and 3.10 imply the following proposition.

Proposition 3.11. *If $\sigma^2 + \Pi(]-1,0[) > 0$ and $\sigma_P^2 + (\tilde{a}_P^0)^+ > 0$, then the support of $\mathcal{L}(Q)$ is unbounded from above.*

Lemma 3.12. *Suppose that $\sigma^2 > 0$ or $\Pi(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$ or $\Pi^a \ne 0$. Then the measure $\mathcal{L}(M)^a \ne 0$.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{L}(M)^a \ne 0$ if and only if $\mathcal{L}(V_1)^a \ne 0$. Also, $\mathcal{L}(M)$ has a continuous density simultaneously with $\mathcal{L}(V_1)$; the latter distribution admits one if $\sigma_V^2 > 0$ or $\Pi_V(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$, see Proposition 3.12 in [6]. Recall that $\sigma_V^2 = \sigma^2$ and $\Pi_V(\mathbb{R}) = \Pi(\mathbb{R})$. It remains to consider the case, where $\sigma = 0$ and $0 \ne \Pi(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$, i.e. the process V is a compound Poisson process with jump sizes having the distribution $\Pi/\Pi(\mathbb{R})$. It is obvious that if Π spreads out, then the distribution $\mathcal{L}(M) \ne 0$ spreads out as well, and the properties $\Pi^a \ne 0$ and $\mathcal{L}(M)^a$ hold simultaneously. □

Summarizing, we have the following:

Theorem 3.13. *Suppose that* **A.0** $-$ **A.2** *hold, ensuring the existence of* $\beta \in]0, \bar{q}[$ *such that* $H(\beta) = 0$ *and the following conditions are fulfilled:*

(i) $\sigma^2 + \Pi(]-1, 0[) > 0$, *or* $\Pi(xI_{\{x>0\}}) = \infty$ *and* $\sigma^2 + \Pi^a(\mathbb{R}) > 0$, *or* $\Pi(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$*;*

(ii) $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^\beta) < \infty$ *and* $\sigma_P^2 + (\tilde{a}_P^0)^+ > 0$.

Then

$$\limsup_{u\to\infty} u^\beta \, \Psi(u) < \infty. \tag{3.18}$$

Suppose, moreover, that $\Pi_P(]-\infty, 0[) = 0$ *and* $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^{\beta+\delta}) < \infty$ *for some* $\delta > 0$ *for which* $\beta + \delta < \bar{q}$. *Then there are constants* $C_\infty, \delta_* \in]0, \infty[$ *such that*

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} u^{\delta_*} \left(u^\beta (\Psi(u) - C_\infty \right). \tag{3.19}$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} u^\beta \, \Psi(u) = C_\infty. \tag{3.20}$$

4. Nyrhinen lower bound

In this section we study, following [17], [18], the tail behavior of distribution of the random variable $Y_\infty^* = \sup_{n\geq 1} Y_n$ where

$$Y_n := \sum_{j=1}^{n} Q_j \, Z_{j-1}, \qquad Z_j := \prod_{l=1}^{j} M_l, \tag{4.1}$$

$(M_j, Q_j)_{\geq 1}$ is i.i.d sequence of two-dimensional random variables, $M_j > 0$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that there exist constants* $\delta, \beta > 0$ *such that* $\mathbf{E}\, M_1^\beta = 1$ *and the random variables* $M_1^\beta |\ln M_1|$, $M_1^{\beta+\delta}$, *and* $|Q_1|^{\beta+\delta}$ *are integrable. Moreover, suppose that* $\kappa := \mathbf{E}\, M_1^\beta \ln M_1 > 0$, $P(M_1 \neq 1) > 0$, *and support of* $\mathcal{L}(Q_1)$ *is unbounded from above. Then*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\ln u} \ln \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u) \geq -\beta \,. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Let $L_k := \sum_{j\leq k} (\ln M_j - \kappa)$. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and define the set

$$D_n(\epsilon) = \left\{ \max_{k\leq m_n} |L_k| > \epsilon n \,, \max_{k\leq m_n} |Q_k| \leq e^{\epsilon n} \right\}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $m_n = [n/\kappa]$ and $[.]$ denotes the integer part. Let us check that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbf{P}(D_n(\epsilon)) \geq -\beta\,. \tag{4.4}$$

Without loss of generality assume that the random variables (M_j, Q_j) are coordinate mappings on the space $(\mathcal{X}^\infty, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}^\infty), \mathbf{P})$ where $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ is the product measure whose marginals are the distribution of (M_j, Q_j). For each m we define on the σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}^m)$, generated by the firdt m coordinate, the measure $\tilde{P}_m := Z_m P$. By the Kolmogorov theorem there exists (unique) measure $\tilde{P}$ with restrictions on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}^m)$ coinciding with $\tilde{P}_m$.

Note that $(M_j)_{j\geq 1}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with respect to $\tilde{P}$ and

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{E}} \ln M_1 = \mathbf{E}\, M_1^\beta \ln M_1 = \kappa\,.$$

By the strong law of large numbers $L_k \to 0$ $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $k \to \infty$. It follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \widetilde{\mathbf{P}} \left(\max_{k\leq m_n} |L_k| > \epsilon n \right) = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

By the Hölder inequality

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{E}}\, |Q_1|^\delta = \mathbf{E}\, M_1^\beta\, |Q_1|^\delta \leq \left(\mathbf{E}\, M_1^{\beta+\delta} \right)^{\beta/(\beta+\delta)} \left(\mathbf{E}\, Q_1^{\beta+\delta} \right)^{\delta/(\beta+\delta)} < \infty\,.$$

Using the Chebyshev inequality and dominating the maximum by the sum, we have that

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{P}} \left(\max_{k\leq m_n} |Q_k| > e^{\epsilon n} \right) \leq m_n\, \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}\, |Q_1|^\delta\, e^{-\epsilon n} \to 0, \quad n \to \infty\,.$$

Combining this relation with (4.5) we obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}\, (D_n(\epsilon)) = 1\,. \tag{4.6}$$

For any $\delta \in]0, \epsilon]$

$$\mathbf{P}(D_n(\epsilon)) \geq \mathbf{P}(D_n(\delta)) = \widetilde{\mathbf{E}}\, \mathbf{1}_{D_n(\delta)}\, Z_{m_n}^{-\beta} \geq e^{-\beta(\kappa m_n + \delta n)}\, \widetilde{\mathbf{P}}\, (D_n(\epsilon))$$

and we get that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbf{P}(D_n(\epsilon)) \geq -\beta - \delta\,.$$

Letting $\delta \to 0$ we obtain (4.4).

Since $\mathbf{E}\, M_1^{\beta} = 1$ and $P(M_1 \neq 1) > 0$, there exists $b > 1$ such that $\mathbf{P}\,(M_1 \geq b) > 0$. Thus, for sufficiently large $\Upsilon > 0$

$$q := \mathbf{P}\,(Q > -\Upsilon\,,\; M_1 \geq b) > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Put

$$G_n := \bigcap_{j=m_n+1}^{t_n} \left\{Q_j > -\Upsilon,\; M_j \geq b\right\} \cap \left\{Q_{t_n+1} > \Lambda\right\}, \tag{4.8}$$

where $t_n := m_n + [\nu n] + 1$, $\nu := 5\epsilon/\ln b$ and $\Lambda := \Upsilon/(b-1) + 2$. It is clear that

$$\mathbf{P}\,(G_n) = q^{[\nu n]+1}\, \mathbf{P}\,(Q_1 > \Lambda)\,.$$

On the set $D_n(\epsilon)$ we get

$$Y_{m_n} \;\geq\; \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} Q_k\, Z_{k-1} \geq\; -e^{\epsilon n} \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} Z_{k-1} \geq\; -\,m_n\, e^{\kappa m_n + 2\epsilon n} \geq\; -e^{n+3\epsilon n}.$$

Note that

$$Y_{t_n+1} = Y_{m_n} + \Delta_n\, Z_{t_n}, \qquad \Delta_n := \sum_{k=m_n+1}^{t_n} Q_k \prod_{j=k}^{t_n} M_j^{-1} \;+\; Q_{t_n+1}\,.$$

On the set G_n using the definition of Λ we estimate Δ_n from below as

$$\Delta_n \geq \Lambda - \Upsilon \sum_{k=m_n+1}^{t_n} \frac{1}{b^{t_n-k+1}} \;\geq\; \Lambda - \frac{\Upsilon}{b-1} = 2\,.$$

On the set $D_n(\epsilon) \cap G_n$ for sufficiently large n we have:

$$Z_{t_n} = \prod_{k=1}^{m_n} M_k \prod_{k=m_n+1}^{t_n} M_k \;\geq\; e^{\kappa\, m_n - n\epsilon + \nu n \ln b} \geq e^{(1-2\epsilon+\nu\ln b)n} = e^{(1+3\epsilon)n}\,.$$

Therefore, on the set $D_n(\epsilon) \cap G_n$ for sufficiently large n

$$Y_{t_n+1} \;\geq\; e^{n+3\epsilon n}\,.$$

Finally, choosing

$$n = \left[\frac{1}{1+3\epsilon} \ln u\right] + 1$$

we obtain that for sufficiently large n

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u) &\geq \mathbf{P}\left(D_n(\epsilon) \cap G_n\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(D_n(\epsilon)\right) \mathbf{P}\left(G_n\right) \\ &= \mathbf{P}\left(D_n(\epsilon)\right) q^{[\nu n]+1} \mathbf{P}\left(Q_1 > \Lambda\right).\end{aligned}$$

So, taking into account that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\ln u} \ln \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u) = \frac{1}{1+3\epsilon} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u),$$

we obtain that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\ln u} \ln \mathbf{P}(Y_\infty^* > u) \geq -\frac{\beta + \nu|\ln q|}{1+3\epsilon} = -\frac{\beta + 5\epsilon|\ln q|/\ln b}{1+3\epsilon}.$$

Letting $\epsilon \to 0$ we obtain (4.2). □

5. Ruin with probability one

In this section we give conditions under which the ruin is eminent whatever is the initial reserve.

Recall the following ergodic property of the autoregression process $(X_n^u)_{n\geq 1}$ with random coefficients (see, [24], Prop. 7.1) given recursively by the relations

$$X_n^u = A_n X_{n-1}^u + B_n, \qquad n \geq 1, \quad X_0^u = u, \tag{5.1}$$

where $(A_n, B_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{E}|A_n|^\delta < 1$ *and* $\mathbf{E}|B_n|^\delta < \infty$ *for some* $\delta \in]0,1[$. *Then for any* $u \in \mathbb{R}$ *the sequence* X_n^u *converges in* L^δ *(hence, in probability) to the random variable*

$$X_\infty^0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} B_n \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j$$

and for any bounded continuous function f

$$\mathbf{P}\text{-}\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} f(X_n^u) = \mathbf{E} f(X_\infty^0). \tag{5.2}$$

Applying the lemma to the function $f(x) = I_{\{x<-1\}} - xI_{\{-1\leq x<0\}}$ we get:

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{E}|A_n|^\delta < 1$ *and* $\mathbf{E}|B_n|^\delta < \infty$ *for some* $\delta \in]0,1[$. *If* $\mathbf{P}(X^0_\infty < 0) > 0$, *then* $\mathbf{P}(\inf_{n\geq 1} X^u_n < 0) = 1$.

Let M_n and Q_n be the same as in (2.13), and $Q_1 = -Y_1$.

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{E}M_1^{-\delta} < 1$ *and* $\mathbf{E}M_1^{-\delta}|Y_1|^\delta < \infty$ *for some* $\delta \in]0,1[$ *and the support of* $\mathcal{L}(Y_1)$ *is unbounded from above. Then* $\Psi(u) \equiv 1$.

Proof. The process X^u solving the equation (1.1) and restricted to the integer values of the time scale admits the representation

$$X^u_n = e^{V_n - V_{n-1}} X^u_{n-1} + e^{V_n} \int_{]n-1,n]} e^{-V_{t-}} dP_t, \qquad n \geq 1, \quad X^u_0 = u.$$

That is, X^u_n is given by (5.1) with $A_n = M_n^{-1}$ and $B_n = -M_n^{-1} Q_n$.

Put $X^{0,1}_\infty := \sum_{n=2}^\infty B_n \prod_{j\geq 2}^{n-1} A_j$. Then

$$X^0_\infty = B_1 + A_1\, X^{0,1}_\infty = M_1^{-1}(X^{0,1}_\infty - Y_1).$$

Since Y_1 and $X^{0,1}_\infty$ are independent, $\mathbf{P}(X^0_\infty < 0) > 0$ due to assumption that the support $\mathcal{L}(Y_1)$ is unbounded from above. The claim follows from Corollary 5.2. □

Now we give more specific conditions of the ruin almost surely in terms of the defining characteristics. The most important property we need is that the function $H(q)$ defined in (3.1) but considered now for the negative values of the argument has the negative left derivative at zero.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that* $\underline{q} < 0$, $\bar{q} > 0$, $\sigma^2 + \Pi(]-1,0[) > 0$, *and* $a_V + \Pi(\bar{h}(\ln(1+x))) < 0$. *Suppose, moreover, that* $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^\varepsilon) < \infty$ *for some* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\sigma_P^2 + (\tilde{a}^0_P)^+ > 0$. *Then* $\Psi(u) \equiv 1$.

Proof. For any $q \in]\underline{q}, 0]$ the value $\mathbf{E}M_1^q$ is finite. The left derivative $D^- H(0) = -a - \Pi(\bar{h}(\ln(1+x))) > 0$. Hence, for all $q < 0$ sufficiently close to zero $H(q) < 0$, i.e. $\mathbf{E}M_1^q < 1$.

Taking into account the distribution of a Lévy process $(L_t)_{t\leq 1}$ with zero drift coefficient is the same as of the process $(L_1 - L_{(1-t)-})_{t\leq 1}$, we get that $\mathcal{L}(M_1^{-1}Y_1) = \mathcal{L}(Y_1)$. If $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^\varepsilon) < \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then Lemma 3.4 ensures that $\mathbf{E}|Y_1|^p < \infty$ for sufficiently small $p > 0$. Due to Proposition 3.11 the conditions on the characteristics of the process P imply that the support of

$\mathcal{L}(Q)$ is unbounded from above. Thus, all conditions of Proposition 5.3 hold and the result follows. □

The above theorem implies that in the classical model with negative risk sums (where $\sigma_P = 0$, the jumps of P are positive and form a compound Poisson process, $\Pi_P(|x|) < \infty$, trend is negative, i.e. $\tilde{a}_P - \Pi_P(x) < 0$) and investments into a risky asset with the price following a geometric Brownian motion (that is, $\Pi = 0$ and $\sigma \neq 0$), the ruin is imminent if $a_V = a - \sigma^2/2 < 0$. The following result implies the same conclusion for the critical case where $a_V = 0$.

Theorem 5.5. *Suppose that* $\underline{q} < 0$, $\bar{q} > 0$, $\sigma^2 + \Pi(]-1, 0[) > 0$, *and* $a_V + \Pi(\bar{h}(\ln(1+x))) = 0$. *Suppose, moreover, that* $\Pi_P(|\bar{h}|^\varepsilon) < \infty$ *for some* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\sigma_P^2 + (\tilde{a}_P^0)^+ > 0$. *If, in addition,* $\Pi(\ln^2(1+x))) < \infty$, *then* $\Psi(u) \equiv 1$.

Proof. The arguments in the previous proof are based on reduction of the ruin problem for the continuous-time process $X^u = (X_t^u)_{t\in\mathbb{R}_+}$ to that for the discrete-time process $(X_n^u)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Following [24] we consider the latter at the descending ladder times T_n of the random walk $(V_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined as follows: $T_0 := 0$,

$$T_n := \inf\{k > T_{n-1} \colon\ V_k - V_{T_{n-1}} < 0\}.$$

Turning back to the definition of the process V given by (2.4) we observe that $EV_1^2 < \infty$ due to condition $\Pi(\ln^2(1+x))) < \infty$ while the condition $a_V + \Pi(\bar{h}(\ln(1+x))) = 0$ means that $EV_1 = 0$. Accordingly to Theorem 1a from Ch. XII.7 of Feller's book [7] and the remark preceding the citing theorem, the above properties imply that there is a finite constant c such that

$$\mathbf{P}\,(T_1 > n) \le cn^{-1/2}. \tag{5.3}$$

It follows, in particular, that the differences $T_n - T_{n-1}$ are well-defined and form a sequence of finite independent random variables distributed as T_1. The discrete-time process $\tilde{X}_n^u = X_{T_n}^u$ has the representation

$$\tilde{X}_n^u = e^{V_{T_n} - V_{T_{n-1}}} \tilde{X}_{n-1}^u + e^{V_{T_n}} \int_{]T_{n-1}, T_n]} e^{-V_{t-}}\, dP_t, \qquad n \ge 1, \quad \tilde{X}_0^u = u,$$

and solves the linear equation

$$\tilde{X}_n^u = \tilde{A}_n \tilde{X}_{n-1}^u + \tilde{B}_n, \qquad n \ge 1, \quad X_0^u = u,$$

where

$$\tilde{A}_n := e^{V_{T_n} - V_{T_{n-1}}}, \qquad \tilde{B}_n := e^{V_{T_n}} \int_{]T_{n-1}, T_n]} e^{-V_{t-}} dP_t.$$

By construction, $\mathbf{E}\tilde{A}_1^\delta > 1$ for any $\delta > 0$.

Using the definition of Q_j given by (2.13) we have that

$$|\tilde{B}_1| \le \sum_{j=1}^{T_1} e^{V_{T_1} - V_{j-1}} |Q_j| \le \sum_{j=1}^{T_1} |Q_j|.$$

Accordingly to Lemma 3.4 $\mathbf{E}|Q_1|^p$ is finite for some $p \in]0,1[$. Then for $r \in]0, p/5[$ and $l_n := [n^{4r}]$, we have, using the Chebyshev inequality and (5.3), that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\,|\tilde{B}_1|^r &\le 1 + r \sum_{n\ge 1} n^{r-1} \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{T_1} |Q_j| > n \right) \\
&\le 1 + r \sum_{n\ge 1} n^{r-1}\, \mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{l_n} |Q_j| > n \right) + r \sum_{n\ge 1} n^{r-1} \mathbf{P}\,(T_1 > l_n) \\
&\le 1 + r\mathbf{E}|Q_1|^p \sum_{n\ge 1} l_n n^{r-1-p} + rc \sum_{n\ge 1} n^{r-1} l_n^{-1/2} < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to check that the support of $\mathcal{L}(Y_{T_1})$ is unbounded from above. Since $\{Q_1 > N\,,\, V_1 < 0\} \subseteq \{Y_{T_1} > N\}$, it is sufficient to check that the probability of the set in the left-hand side is positive for all $N > 0$, or, in virtue of Remark 3.9, that

$$\mathbf{P}(J > N, V_1 < 0) > 0 \qquad \forall\, N > 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Let $\sigma^2 > 0$. Taking into account that the conditional distribution of the process $(W_s)_{s\le 1}$ given $W_1 = x$ is the same as the (unconditional) distribution of the Brownian bridge $B^x = (B^x_s)_{s\le 1}$ with $B^x_s = W_s + s(x - W_1)$ we easily get that for any bounded positive function g and any $y, M \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\int_0^1 e^{-\sigma W_v} g(v) dv > y\,,\, W_1 < M \right) > 0,$$

cf. with Lemma 4.2 in [12]. This implies (5.4).

Suppose that $\sigma^2 = 0$, but $\Pi(]-1,0[) > 0$, i.e. $\Pi(]-1,-\varepsilon[) > 0$ for some $\varepsilon \in]0,1[$. In the decomposition $V = V^{(1)} + V^{(2)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^{(1)} &= I_{\{-1<x\le-\varepsilon\}} \ln(1+x) * \mu_t, \\ V_t^{(2)} &= (a - \Pi(]-1,-\varepsilon[))t + I_{\{x>-\varepsilon\}} h(x) * (\mu-\nu)_t \\ &\quad + I_{\{x>-\varepsilon\}} (\ln(1+x) - h(x)) * \mu_t, \end{aligned}$$

the processes $V^{(1)}$ and $V^{(2)}$ are independent. The process $V^{(1)}$ is decreasing by negative jumps whose absolute value are larger or equal than $|\ln(1-\varepsilon)|$ and the number of jumps on the interval $[0,1/2]$ has the Poisson distribution with parameter $(1/2)\Pi(]-1,-\varepsilon[) > 0$. Thus, $\mathbf{P}(V^{(1)}_{1/2} < -N) > 0$ for any real N. These properties imply (5.4). □

6. Examples

Example 1. Let consider the model with negative risk sums in which $\Pi_P(dx) = \lambda F_P(dx)$ where the constant $\lambda > 0$ and the probability distribution $F_P(dx)$ is concentrated on $]0,\infty[$, and

$$\tilde{a}_P^0 := \lambda \int_{[0,1]} x F_P(dx) - a_P.$$

The process P admits the representation as sum of an independent Wiener process with drift and a compound Poisson process:

$$P_t = -\tilde{a}_P^0 t + \sigma_P W_t^P + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^P} \xi_j. \tag{6.1}$$

where the Poisson process N^P with intensity λ_P is independent on the sequence $(\xi_j)_{j\ge1}$ of positive i.i.d. random variables with common distribution F_P.

The price process is a geometric Brownian motion

$$\mathcal{E}_t(R) = e^{V_t} = e^{(a-\sigma^2/2)t+\sigma W_t},$$

that is $\sigma \neq 0$, $\Pi = 0$.

Suppose that $\sigma_P^2 + (a_P^0)^+ > 0$ and $\sigma^2/2 < a$. In such a case the function $H(q) = (\sigma^2/2 - a + q\sigma^2/2)q$ has the root $\beta = 2a/\sigma^2 - 1 > 0$. By Theorem

3.13 the exact asymptotic (3.20), i.e. $\Psi(u) \sim C_\infty u^{-\beta}$, as $u \to \infty$, holds if there is $\delta > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}\xi_1^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$. Since the exponential distribution has the above property, we recover, as a very particular case the asymptotic result of [12] where it was assumed that $\sigma_P^2 = 0$ and $a_P^0 > 0$.

If $\sigma_P^2 + (a_P^0)^+ > 0$, $\sigma^2/2 \geq a$, $\mathbf{E}\xi_1^\epsilon < \infty$, then Theorems 5.4 and 5.5 imply that $\Psi(u) \equiv 1$.

Example 2. Suppose that the process P is again given by (6.1) while the price process has a jump component, namely,

$$\mathcal{E}_t(R) = \exp\Big\{(a - \sigma^2/2)t + \sigma W_t + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \ln(1+\eta_j)\Big\},$$

where the Poisson process N with intensity $\lambda > 0$ is independent on the sequence $(\eta_j)_{j\geq 1}$ of i.i.d. random variables with common distribution F not concentrated at zero and $F(]-\infty, -1]) = 0$, see [14], Ch. 7. That is, the log price process is represented as

$$V_t = (a - \sigma^2/2)t + \sigma W_t + \ln(1+x) * \mu_t,$$

where $\Pi(dx) = \lambda F(dx)$. The function H is given by the formula

$$H(q) = (\sigma^2/2 - a + q\sigma^2/2)q + \lambda \int \Big((1+x)^{-q} - 1\Big) F(dx).$$

Suppose that $\sigma \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{E}\,(1+\eta_1)^{-q} < \infty$ for all $q > 0$ (so, $\bar{q} = \infty$). If

$$D^+H(0) = \sigma^2/2 - a - \lambda \mathbf{E} \ln(1+\eta_1) < 0, \tag{6.2}$$

i.e. the condition **A.1** holds, then the root $\beta > 0$ of the equation $H(q) = 0$ does exist. Thus, if $\sigma_P^2 + (a_P^0)^+ > 0$ and $\mathbf{E}\xi_1^{\beta+\delta} < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$, then Theorem 3.13 can be applied to get that $\Psi(u) \sim C_\infty u^{-\beta}$, as $u \to \infty$.

Note that the root β is smaller (resp. larger) than $\beta_1 := 2a/\sigma^2 - 1$ (the root of the model in the first example where the price process is continuous) if $\mathbf{E}(1+\eta_1)^{\beta_1} < 1$ (resp. $\mathbf{E}(1+\eta_1)^{\beta_1} > 1$).

Suppose that $\sigma = 0$ and $\mathbf{E}\,(1+\eta_1)^{-q} < \infty$ for all $q > 0$. If

$$D^+H(0) = -a - \lambda \mathbf{E}\, \ln(1+\eta_1) < 0,$$

and

$$\limsup_{q\to\infty} q^{-1} \mathbf{E}\left((1+\eta_1)^{-q} - 1\right) > a/\lambda,$$

than the root $\beta > 0$ also exists. To apply Theorem 3.13 in this case we need extra assumptions on F, namely, that $\mathbf{P}(-1 < \eta_1 < 0) > 0$, or $F^a \neq 0$ and $E\eta_1 = \infty$ in addition to the above hypotheses on the process P.

Theorems 5.4 and 5.5 claim that $\Psi(u) \equiv 1$, if the inequality in (6.2) does not hold, at least, when $\sigma \neq 0$, $\mathbf{E}\,(1+\eta_1)^{-q} < \infty$ for all $q \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{E}\,\ln(1+\eta_1)^2 < \infty$, and $\mathbf{E}|\xi_1|^{\varepsilon} < \infty$, $\sigma_P^2 + (a_P^0)^+ > 0$.

7. Appendix: tails of distributions solving renewal equations

We write the renewal equations which are equations where the data and the unknowns are distributions in a more compact form using the language of random variables. We consider two renewal equations where unknown are random variables R and $\check{R}$:

$$R \stackrel{d}{=} Q + M\,R\,, \quad R \text{ independent of } (M,Q) \tag{7.1}$$

($\stackrel{d}{=}$ means equality in law) and

$$\check{R} \stackrel{d}{=} \check{Q} + M\,\check{R}^+\,, \quad \check{R} \text{ independent of } (\check{Q}\,,\check{M}). \tag{7.2}$$

For these equations the uniqueness means the uniqueness of corresponding laws.

Lemma 7.1 (Lemma 2.2 in [9]). *Let $M > 0$ be a random variable such that the law of $\ln M$ is non-arithmetic and, for some $\beta > 0$,*

$$\mathbf{E}\,M^{\beta} = 1\,, \quad \mathbf{E}\,M^{\beta}\,(\ln M)^+ < \infty. \tag{7.3}$$

Then $\ln \mathbf{E}M \in [-\infty, 0[$ and $\kappa := \mathbf{E}M^{\beta} \ln M \in]0, \infty[$.

Lemma 7.2 (Th. 4.1 in [9]). *Let Q and M be random variables defined on the same probability space and satisfying the conditions of Lemma 7.1. Suppose that $\mathbf{E}\,|Q|^{\beta} < \infty$. Then (7.1) has a unique solution R and*

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} u^{\beta}\,\mathbf{P}(R > u) = C_+ := \frac{1}{\beta\,\kappa}\,\mathbf{E}\,\left(((Q+MR)^+)^{\beta} - ((MR)^+)^{\beta}\right). \tag{7.4}$$

The next lemma follows directly from Theorem 6.3 and Corollary 4.3 in [9].

Lemma 7.3. *Let $M > 0$ be a random variable satisfying the conditions of Lemma 7.1. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}(M)$ spreads out (e.g., the distribution $\mathcal{L}(M)$ has an absolute continuous component) and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbf{E}\, M^{\beta+\delta} < \infty\,, \quad \mathbf{E}\,|\check{Q}|^{\beta+\delta} < \infty, \tag{7.5}$$

and for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\mathbf{E}\, M^{\beta+\delta+ix} \neq 1. \tag{7.6}$$

Then (7.2) has a unique solution $\check{R}$ and, for some $\delta_* > 0$,

$$\lim_{u\to\infty} u^{\delta_*}\left(u^{\beta}\mathbf{P}(\check{R} > u) - \check{C}\right) = 0\,, \tag{7.7}$$

where

$$\check{C} = \frac{1}{\beta\kappa}\mathbf{E}\left(\left((\check{Q} + M\,\check{R}^{+})^{+}\right)^{\beta} - \left(M\,\check{R}^{+}\right)^{\beta}\right)\,.$$

Acknowledgements. The research is funded by the grant of the Government of Russian Federation $n°$14.A12.31.0007. The second author is partially supported by the grant of RSF number 14-49-00079, National Research University "MPEI" 14 Krasnokazarmennaya, 111250 Moscow, Russia. .

References

[1] Albrecher H., Badescu A., Landriault D. On the dual risk model with taxation, Insurance: Mathematics and Economics, **42** (2008), 1086–1094.

[2] Asmussen S., Albrecher H. *Ruin Probabilities.* World Scientific, Singapore, 2010.

[3] Avanzi B., Gerber H.U., Shiu E.S.W. Optimal dividends in the dual model. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, **41** (2007), 111–123.

[4] Bayraktar E., Egami M. Optimizing venture capital investments in a jump diffusion model. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, **67** (2008), 1, 21–42.

[5] Bichteler K., Jacod J. Calcul de Malliavin pour les diffusions avec sauts: existence dune densité dans le cas unidimensionnel. *Séminaire de probabilité, XVII*, Lecture Notes in Math., **986**, Springer, Berlin, 1983, 132–157.

[6] Cont R., Tankov P. *Financial Modelling with Jump Processes.* Chapman & Hall, 2004.

[7] Feller W. *An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications.* **2**, 2nd edition, Wiley, New York, 1971.

[8] Frolova A., Kabanov Yu., Pergamenshchikov S. In the insurance business risky investments are dangerous, *Finance and Stochastics*, **6** (2002), 227–235.

[9] Goldie C.M. Implicit renewal theory and tails of solutions of random equations. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, **1** (1991), 1, 126–166.

[10] Grandell I. *Aspects of Risk theory.* Springer, Berlin, 1990.

[11] Jacod J., Shiryaev A.N. *Limit theorems for stochastic processes.* 2nd edition, Springer, Berlin, 2002.

[12] Kabanov Yu., Pergamenshchikov S. In the insurance business risky investments are dangerous: the case of negative risk sums. *Finance and Stochastics*, **20** (2016), 2, 355 – 379.

[13] Kalashnikov V., Norberg R. Power tailed ruin probabilities in the presence of risky investments. Preprint. Laboratory of Actuarial Math., Univ. of Copenhagen, 2000.

[14] Lamberton D., Lapeyre B. Introduction to Stochastic Calculus Applied to Finance. Chapman & Hall, London, 1996.

[15] Marinelli C., Röckner M. On maximal inequalities for purely discontinuous martingales in infinite dimensions. *Séminaire de Probabilités*, Lect. Notes Math., **XLVI** (2014), 293–315.

[16] Novikov A.A. On discontinuous martingales. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, **20**, (1975), 1, 11–26.

[17] Nyrhinen H. On the ruin probabilities in a general economic environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **83** (1999), 319–330.

[18] Nyrhinen H. Finite and infinite time ruin probabilities in a stochastic economic environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **92** (2001), 265–285.

[19] Paulsen J. Risk theory in stochastic economic environment. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **46** (1993), 327–361.

[20] Paulsen J. *Stochastic Calculus with Applications to Risk Theory.* Lecture Notes, Univ. of Bergen and Univ. of Copenhagen, 1996.

[21] Paulsen J. Sharp conditions for certain ruin in a risk process with stochastic return on investments. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **75** (1998), 135–148.

[22] Paulsen J. On Cramér-like asymptotics for risk processes with stochastic return on investments. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, **12** (2002), 4, 1247–1260.

[23] Paulsen J., Gjessing H. K. Ruin theory with stochastic return on investments. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, **29** (1997), 4, 965–985.

[24] Pergamenshchikov S., Zeitouni O. Ruin probability in the presence of risky investments. *Stoch. Process. Appl.*, **116** (2006), 267–278. Erratum to: "Ruin probability in the presence of risky investments". *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **119** (2009), 1, 305–306.

[25] Sato K. *Lévy processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[26] Saxén T. On the probability of ruin in the collective risk theory for insurance enterprises with only negative risk sums. *Scand. Actuarial J.* 1948, 1-2, 199–228.